

LABOUR 1s. **MONTHLY**

EDITOR . R PALME DUTT

“We Have Been Warned”

R.P.D.

Trade Unions and Communism

Arthur Horner

Who Hinders Production?

J. R. Campbell

Marx and Engels, February 1848

Book Reviews

K. Zilliacus, M.P.

John Gollan

FEBRUARY, 1948

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

	<i>Page</i>
Notes of the Month: " <i>We Have Been Warned</i> "	
by R. P. D. ...	33
Trade Unions and Communism	
by ARTHUR HORNER ...	41
Who Hinders Production? by J. R. CAMPBELL ...	48
Foreign Imperialism in Indonesia by NEIL STEWART ...	52
<i>100 Years Ago</i> —The Revolution Begins, in Paris ...	57
<i>Book Reviews</i> —	
Star-Spangled Shadow, by D. N. Pritt, K.C.,	
M.P.: K. Zilliacus, M.P.	63
Lenin and the Russian Revolution, by Christopher	
Hill: J. Gollan	63
The New Malaya, by E. E. Dodd: M. J. C. ...	64

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

To Labour Monthly, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

NAME..... ADDRESS.....
 (Please use Block Capitals)

.....

I wish to become a postal subscriber to LABOUR MONTHLY and enclose
12/- (Home) to cover twelve months' subscription beginning with the
13/- (Abroad)

.....Issue.
 (Strike out the words which do not apply.)

Signed..... Date.....

Air Mail Rates according to destination. Until Printed Matter Air Mail
 Rates are restored full Letter Air Mail Rate has to be paid at the weight
 of ONE OUNCE.

out Communism", "Down with the Soviet Union", they are really declaring "We want dollars", "We are desperate for dollars", "We will do anything for dollars—only, for heaven's sake, hurry up with the dollar aid, or we go under".

"Marshall versus Marx"

The coincidence of dates is worth noting. On December 22 Morgan Phillips' Merry Christmas circular was broadcast to disrupt the trade unions and remove their backbone by driving out the militants, just as the Labour Party was filleted years ago. But on December 19 the Right Wing minority in France had already broken away from the French Trade Union Congress—a classic example of the disruption of the trade union movement by *the Right Wing*, with the full approval of Morgan Phillips. A very neatly co-ordinated offensive, which it is now attempted to extend to the World Federation of Trade Unions, with the paternal supervision of the representative of the American Federation of Labour to direct operations in all three cases. In Brazil the Communist deputies are expelled from parliament—a classic example of democracy à l'américaine. In Washington the witch-hunt seeks to spread panic fear of "dangerous thoughts", and a Communist leader is prosecuted for seeking to "overthrow the government". In London the Labour Party and the French Socialist Party announce their intention to call a Conference of "Marshall Socialist Parties" in March—a novel kind of "International" of the serfs bearing their Master's emblem, and giving a fresh twist to the old slogan "Marshall versus Marx".

General Marshall's Third Force

To bewildered backwoods Congressmen and Senators who have been brought up in the belief that Socialism is the enemy to be destroyed, the State Department issues an informative report giving elementary political education on the "E.R.P. countries" (Marshall countries), and explaining that "Socialist influence is predominant in some E.R.P. countries and strong in most", but that American Big Business need have no fear, since "the Socialists are among the strongest bulwarks in Europe against Communism". With rising enthusiasm the American millionaires begin to get wise to the idea of the "Third Force":

Another conception gaining adherents and capturing imaginations, as Legislators ask scores of questions of those testifying, is the idea of creating a "Third Force" in international affairs to act both as a buffer and balance between Communist Russia and capitalistic America.

It took the present hearings to get a formal statement from the State Department that European Socialism is a bulwark against the suppression of individual liberties, and that Socialists are among the strongest bulwarks of Europe against Communism.

(Washington correspondent, *Sunday Times*, January 18).

The famous "Third Force" would thus appear to be not quite so independent of America as some of its exponents would like to pretend.

Operating under the patronage of the State Department, the "Third Force" is revealed as the accommodation address of the servitors of American imperialism. Fascism had its "Fifth Column"; American imperialism has its "Third Force".

Cripps Blows the Gaff

Those who would seek to understand the motive power behind the bellicose anti-Soviet anti-communist speeches with which Mr. Attlee and Mr. Morrison have greeted the New Year would do well to study the parallel speech of Sir Stafford Cripps on the economic situation. Setting out firmly the Quest of the Holy Grail for the British people in 1948

"The first and most important objective in 1948 is to earn more dollars"

he proceeded to expose the gloomy facts of the existing situation and perspective in the light of that aim. The visible trade deficit for 1947 was £591 million, as against £336 million for 1946. The dollar and gold reserves drain was running at the end of the year at close on £600 million a year. Dollar and western hemisphere currency exports for 1947 were estimated at £190 million. What of the prospect for 1948? Exports must be raised from 112 per cent. of 1938 to 140 per cent. by mid 1948 and 160 per cent. by the end of 1948. But

the rise from 112 per cent. to 140 per cent. of the export volume of 1938 is going to be much more difficult to attain than that hitherto achieved, because our expansion of exports has hitherto taken place in a sellers' market. Many of our products are now beginning to meet competition.

Dollar exports must be raised 50 per cent., i.e. from £190 million to £285 million. But even if this formidable target is achieved (a considerable "if"), the result will still be a £300 million dollar deficit for 1948. How is this £300 million dollar deficit to be met? Existing gold and dollar reserves are stated to be £500 million. By the end of the year they are expected to fall to £250 million. But long before this figure would be reached, it is widely anticipated that a financial crisis would follow from the reserves falling below the minimum necessary operating level. What solution does Cripps offer? The only solution offered is dollar aid under the Marshall Plan:

Britain must not count upon aid under the Marshall Plan, but it was obvious from the figures given that she would be in a grave position as regards dollars unless aid was forthcoming. We should not be able to get through without further cuts of imports of food and raw materials from the Western Hemisphere essential to support our present production.

The pretence of a programme based on independence is abandoned. The Government has no solution to offer save dollar aid under the Marshall Plan. Everything is staked on this gamble. Hence the increasingly desperate and open subservience to American orders; the retreat in every field of foreign policy; the anxious offering of Britain as a pawn for American war plans, as a bailiff for colonising Western

Why the Excitement?

Why this raging, roaring offensive at this moment against the Communists and the left wing? We are always being told by the exponents of this offensive that Communism in Britain is "negligible"—except when they vary the formula to declare that it is "now waning." In that case, why all the excitement? The innocent newspaper-reader might be excused for failing to grasp the theory of negligibility when fifteen million sheets are delivered to every household with seven-column screaming headlines denouncing the menace of Communism in Britain. When a Communist is narrowly defeated in a district election of a trade union, the result is placarded at the top of the front page like a battle victory in a major campaign. It is true that when a Communist is elected general secretary of a leading trade union, the theory of negligibility again applies, and the news either disappears or is relegated to a small paragraph on a back page. When the Premier broadcasts to the nation, his address is devoted to an eloquent denunciation of Communism—secure in the knowledge that the B.B.C. will afford no opportunity for reply. Twelve "party political broadcasts" in a year reveal a mighty common front in denunciation of Communism; but when it is suggested that it might be desirable to hear the other side, the theory of negligibility again applies and precludes a reply.

Holding Out the Hat for Dollars

Are we then to believe that Government Ministers and the political leaders and official mentors of opinion are really so panic-stricken over the prospective victory of Communism in Britain? Have they really begun to suspect that the common front of Toryism and Right Wing Labour on major issues is getting rumbled by public opinion, and that Communism voices the real opposition offering an alternative programme and a practical policy to save Britain? It would be gratifying to believe that political development had already reached this point in Britain. But it is better to be realist. The anti-communist crusade in Britain is only the echo of an American-directed orchestra whose full cacophony is thundering most powerfully in Washington, in France, in Italy, with arms and terror in Greece, in all the Marshall countries. The Government Ministers are not really apprehensive of their immediate downfall before the inevitable triumphant advance of Communism winning the majority of the population in Britain. Even in their most exalted sabre-rattling speeches they can hardly believe that the mailed fist of Britain in its present plight strikes terror in the heart of the Soviet leaders. Their anti-communist crusade is directed to cover up their own economic-political bankruptcy, to prepare the offensive which their economic policy is compelling them to launch against the trade unionists and working people of Britain, and above all to win the favour of the American paymasters and ringmasters. When they clamour with such ostentatious emphasis "Down with Communism", "We shall root

“We Have Been Warned”

THE gloves are off. The battle is joined. At last the Grand Crusade has been proclaimed. Mr. Attlee's New Year broadcast, following Mr. Phillips' Christmas encyclical, and followed by Mr. Morrison's martial oration threatening "war at some time", no doubt to be further developed in Mr. Bevin's forthcoming review of foreign affairs after the disruption of the London Conference, have set the keynote for 1948. After months of economic despond, marching orders have been proclaimed for the British people. Against what enemy? Against Big Business? Against the citadels of wealth and privilege? Against high prices and profits? Against the stranglehold of the American millionaires? Not at all. Against socialism, against the Soviet Union, against the new democracies that have dared to get rid of their landlords and big capitalists, against working class demands for wage increases, against the Communists and the left wing. Here is proclaimed the enemy; the Tory press purrs approval; and the American paymasters sing the praises of their servants. MacDonald's cold heart must glow anew at the fidelity of his disciples, and Goebbels sneer with satisfaction from the shades. Even the Red Letter trick is exhumed once more from the Foreign Office archives of forgery, this time not under the auspices of MacDonald, but under the auspices of Bevin.

“We Have Been Warned”

“Patriotism,” Dr. Johnson used to declare, “is the last refuge of every scoundrel.” Today we would have to revise his proverb. In the days of high class collaboration and subservience to the lords of the dollar, patriotism has taken on a subversive reddish tinge. Today Dr. Johnson would have said: “Anti-Communism is the last refuge of every scoundrel.” Anti-Communism was the stock-in-trade of MacDonald, of Hitler, of Laval, of Quisling, of a countless legion of the dead and the damned for a century. When the Attlees, Morrisons and Phillipses, in face of the collapse of their policies, turn to Anti-Communism for their supreme platform, they are indeed signing their petition in bankruptcy. “We Have Been Warned”, as Morgan Phillips aptly names his circular. The wise will pay less attention to the familiar jargon which is being trotted out for the hundredth time, and look rather for the real offensive which is being prepared behind the patter. For history has shown that the anti-communist crusade is always the prelude to a general offensive against the working class, against the standards of the people, against democracy and the interests of the nation, and for the preparation of war.

Europe, as the instrument for the anti-Soviet anti-communist offensive—with consequences whose cost only drags Britain deeper down in the mire of economic dependence and bankruptcy.

Clouds on the Marshall Mirage

But will the gamble come off? A cold douche to rosy expectations has been administered by the proceedings at Washington over the Marshall Plan and the preliminary facts and figures released by the State Department. The date of biting the long-dangled carrot recedes; after prolonged trepidation and postponement of publication of the Economic Survey for 1948, because of uncertainty whether to count on dollar aid, it looks as if the Survey will have to be published without such certainty. The four year figure of £4,250 million, already cut down from the Paris Report figure of £5,600 million (previously cut down from the original £7,000 million), is reduced to a fifteen months figure of £1,700 million in the Draft Bill to placate opposition. The detailed figures published of proposed allocations prove even more “disappointing”, in the words of *The Times*. “Direct aid for Britain appears to involve about £625 million spread over 4½ years” or “about one-third of Britain’s visible deficit” (*Economist*, 17.1.48). The biggest item is revealed to be Tobacco (£123 million). In general, the choice of items clearly indicates concentration on the articles which American exporters wish to unload (even to the extent of a specific warning against the Paris proposals for increased production of Greek and Turkish tobacco, on the ground that this would interfere with the American hold on the European tobacco market), and severe limitation in respect of assistance to productive development, most notably with regard to steel. This negative attitude is most starkly shown in the veto on European shipbuilding programmes in order to promote expenditure of dollars by the Marshall countries on American shipping. Immediately following this warning, the British Government has obediently cut down steel allocations for shipbuilding by 20 per cent., with disastrous consequences for British production, employment and the export programme.

Paying the Price

The conditions to be imposed in return for such aid (still in process of development and amplification in the process of passage through Congress) are step by step more fully revealed as following the familiar lines of economic colonisation and financial domination: American supervisory agencies under an American Administrator General with local offices in each country; special local currency funds under American control; special rights for American firms establishing factories in European countries; reservation of strategic raw materials for American requirements, etc. Western Europe becomes in this vision the new “China”—in proportion as the Chinese people are victoriously fighting their way to freedom from imperialist intervention and its subsidised local dictators. With regard to planning, the State

Department Report lays down that “detailed rigid planning of peacetime economic activity will not accomplish the objective of economic recovery” and that the basis must be “the initiative and enterprise of individual producers.” The truth of this pearl of economic wisdom is abundantly illustrated by the giant advance of economic recovery of the planned economies of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the bankruptcy of the unplanned economies of Western Europe. In short, the more the outlines of the Marshall Plan descend from the heaven of abstract principles to the earthy context of concrete details, the more it is revealed as a plan designed (1) to endeavour to limit the shock of the impending American economic crisis by subsidising American exports; (2) to facilitate American economic penetration and domination of Western Europe around the central pivot of American monopolist control of Western Germany as its colonial base; (3) to facilitate political intervention in Western Europe and build the anti-Soviet and anti-working class front and promote American strategic war aims. The one thing the Plan does not offer is the path to Britain’s recovery.

A Contrast

In this connection it is worth noting the contrast of two items in two successive days’ issues of *The Times*:

Mr. Douglas told Senator Smith that the standard of living in the sixteen nations would still be lower in 1952—at the end of the Marshall Plan—than it had been in 1938.

(*The Times*, January 9).

By 1949 each of these countries (in Eastern Europe) hopes to have reached or exceeded by a big margin the level of its national income before the war.

(“Planning in Eastern Europe,” *The Times*, January 10).

Yet the heaviest war destruction was in Eastern Europe, not in Western Europe. And Eastern Europe is fighting its way forward without American “aid”.

Shadow of the American Economic Crisis

But will the American imperialists find it so easy to achieve their magniloquent aims? Across the gaily painted chameleon-like perspectives of the Marshall Plan looms ever larger the shadow of the impending American economic crisis. At last President Truman has been compelled to recognise publicly the onset of the monster. In his New Year Message to Congress on January 7 he stated:

Already inflation is undermining the standards of living of millions of families. Inflation holds the threat of another depression, just as we had a depression after the unstable boom of the first world war.

And again on January 14, in his Economic Report to Congress, he painted in detail the familiar picture of the present plight of American capitalism, even more menacing in its own fashion than Cripps’ parallel picture of the unhappy plight of British capitalism: the

picture of feverish expansion of production, rocketing prices, soaring profits and falling real incomes of the people. Summing up these manifestations under the general theme of "inflation" he concluded:

If it continues, a depression is a certainty. There is no telling exactly when the crash may come. One can only be certain that, if permitted to run its course, it will break with destructive force.

And again:

We stand in great danger that runaway prices, over-extended credit and unbalanced developments will lead to an economic recession. We cannot be sure that the recession would not be severe, and recovery slow and painful.

So long as Marxist economists spoke of the prospect of an American economic crisis in 1948, their warnings were dismissed by the devotees of the American economic miracle as the malignant prognostications of doctrinaire fanatics. But when the divinity has spoken through the mouth of President Truman, the *Daily Herald* sits up and takes notice (editorial on "Truman's Warning", January 15):

President Truman cannot be accused of being an alarmist. As the *Daily Herald* has already pointed out, when he utters a warning of trouble ahead, it is well-founded and usually comes true.

And then comes the crux of the anxiety felt by apostles of salvation through the Marshall Plan:

America's dominating economic position in the world today makes the prospect outlined by the President one of urgent importance to all other nations, including ourselves. A serious depression in the United States would lead to reduced production there and to a cutting down of overseas aid programmes.

There's the rub. The clay feet of the Colossus are revealed. If the British Labour Government are placing their hopes of Britain's recovery in the aid of American capitalism, they are not only selling out the true interests of the British people to their enemies, they are casting their anchor in a quicksand.

Offensive on the Home Front

Already the golden pictures of mutual capitalist aid are giving place to the familiar pictures of ruthless competitive conflict for the world market. American and British imperialism may co-operate in the common tasks of counter-revolution, in hostility to the Soviet Union and to the rising democratic anti-imperialist camp from China to Eastern Europe. But even the co-operation conceals conflict in the fight for rival spheres of interest (the squeezing out of Britain in the Far East, in the Ruhr, in Greece and the Middle East); and the economic conflict grows daily more open. The crux of Cripps' speech on the economic perspective for 1948 did not lie in the desperate appeals for dollar aid. The real crux for practical immediate policy lay in those sections which dealt with the problems of the export market, the costs of production and wages. Here the real offensive is laid bare. The costs of production, he declared, must be lowered, if Britain is to compete in the export market. Have we not

heard that theme before? And his subsequent remarks made clear that, as always, when he spoke of lowering the costs of production, it was wages that occupied the forefront of his mind. He declared that wages had increased while prices had remained stable, that these increases were “a source of concern amid the increasingly competitive conditions under which we were selling our manufacture abroad”. But in fact prices have continuously risen, and are rising. To demand that wages must be pegged, while prices are rising, is to demand the reduction of real wages. Plenty of alternative policies are advocated for the same objective. The Government is still hesitant in stating its full aims. The big monopolists crack the whip impatiently. Some propose a standstill to demands for wage increases, while prices are rising. Others concentrate on cutting down the food subsidies. A section urges devaluation as the most effective means of lowering real wages without a direct conflict. But the objective remains the same. The offensive is directed against the real wages and the living standards of the people. This offensive follows inevitably from the bankruptcy of the Government’s economic policy, from their ruinous strategic imperialist policy, and from their dependence on American imperialism. In the path of this offensive the trade unions are seen as the obstacle. And it is as the prelude to this offensive that the attack on Communism and the left wing in the trade unions takes on its immediate practical significance.

Be Prepared

For this reason the trade union and labour movement will need to stand united and prepared. “We Have Been Warned”. The Communist Party is under attack because it is fighting in the forefront for the workers’ standards, because it is exposing the ruinous consequences of the policies of alliance with Toryism and American reaction, and because it is putting forward the only positive practical policy for recovery. The Communist Party’s Three Year “Plan for Prosperity” has not been answered with any attempt at reasoned argument; it has only been met with abuse. But the alternative to the existing policies of capitulation and bankruptcy will have to be found. We do not want to tread the path which leads through worsened standards and deepened crisis to Tory comebacks and to war. The opening events of 1948 have already shown how sharply the issues will be joined in the coming year. And we can be confident that the approaching Congress of the Communist Party at the end of February will help to show the common path forward in the interests equally of all sections of the working class movement and of the recovery of Britain.

January 20, 1948.

R. P. D.

**Look out for the March issue—Centenary of the historic year
1848: and order copies early.**

TRADE UNIONS AND COMMUNISM

By ARTHUR L. HORNER

THE gravity of the situation confronting the British people in 1948 is such as to require the fullest solidarity, the utmost measure of unity amongst all sections of the trade union movement. Food shortages, reduced intake of calories per head, rising prices, cuts in investments in housing and schools, unemployment growing along with a developing capitalist offensive—the situation is such as can be met only by the strength and determination of a united working class. This moment has been chosen by Mr. Morgan Phillips, the Secretary of the Labour Party, as the occasion to introduce tactics of splitting and dividing the trade union movement. This attempt to split the movement, this instruction to the trade unions from on high that they must drive out their duly elected officials if they are Communists, was hugely boosted in the capitalist press and applauded by the most reactionary newspapers.

What has actuated this attack? Does he bring forward any reasoned grounds, any facts on which an argument might be based? No, the facts are lacking in this inflammatory circular of 21st December. More, the one over-riding reason for this attack is not so much as mentioned, namely, that the American capitalists are intensifying their campaign against Socialism and trade unionism, first in their own country, then in France, and now in Britain. The rest is the heated imagination of Mr. Phillips.

That is why this circular contains no reasoning based on reality but much based on assumptions that have no validity. This is the old trick of setting up an Aunt Sally and then knocking it down. The Communist Party has voiced the feeling of rank and file trade unionists that they are not prepared to see the conditions of the workers and their families worsened while swollen profits keep mounting in industry after industry. Immediately Mr. Morgan Phillips soars into the realms of fancy and says “we can expect a campaign of sabotage . . . we can expect Communist inspired attempts to foment discontent in the factories . . . we can expect intensified attempts to undermine and destroy the Labour movement from within.” Why does Mr. Morgan produce these “we can expect” phrases, these expectations of a heated imagination, instead of facts? Is it because he has no facts to produce? Is it because the Bevin-Cripps policy has caused a wave of discontent, which the Right-Wing want to stifle by ascribing its origin to the Communists, as employers used to ascribe discontent to “agitators” or as Hitler used to say “the Jews” are responsible for everything that had gone wrong?

Employers used to follow this up by pressing for anti-trade union legislation (and got it from Baldwin and Churchill in 1927); Hitler followed up his fantastic denouncing of “the Jews” by murderous pogroms; Mr. Morgan Phillips proceeds from his denunciations,

equally without a factual basis, to urge "a great campaign against Communist intrigue and infiltration inside the Labour movement."

After this riot of unbased assumptions, followed by incitement to a campaign of attack against Communists, Mr. Phillips refers to the "influence inside certain trade unions" of the Communists. This influence, he alleges, does not correspond "to their real strength," and is gained through not enough trade unionists attending their branch meetings. "The Communists thrive on apathy" says Mr. Phillips, who then discovers the remedy for this alleged state of affairs in the need for "Labour Party members playing an active part inside their respective trade unions."

Was there ever such topsy-turvy nonsense as this? Is it not a fact that while Morgan Phillips and the Right Wing leaders of the Labour Party were concentrating on other matters more to their taste, it was precisely the Communists who year in, year out, have urged all trade unionists, including Labour Party members, to play an active part in their unions? Is it not the Communists who, by themselves setting an example of playing an active part in union affairs, have won the respect of their fellow members and have been chosen to represent them? Communist officials, truly and democratically elected long before Mr. Phillips was ever heard of, have kept urging full attendance at branch meetings.

The question goes deeper than this. Mr. Phillips' circular is in essence a suggestion that the trade unions are unfit to manage their own affairs. I can remember before the first world war the same sort of suggestion coming from the Liberals, who because of their treatment of the working class were beginning to lose ground in the unions. It was false then and it is false now. The trade unions of this country have always been self-governing, have proceeded by democratic methods and by their methods have chosen men to represent their interests in area or district committees, executive councils and other offices. What has Mr. Phillips to say against the method by which Ebby Edwards or I myself were successively elected to the Secretaryship of the National Union of Mineworkers? Was it not by direct ballot vote? Was not this vote conducted in successive ballots (a far more democratic method, by the way, than Parliamentary elections, where victors often represent minorities), with the candidates lowest on the list dropping out at each stage, so that no vote was thrown away? I think my fellow-countrymen will agree that in the trade unions with the most fully democratic methods, the elections are a better expression of the will of the electors than the present Parliamentary electoral methods which Mr. Herbert Morrison was so anxious to retain. So far from trade unions being unfit to manage their own affairs, it is clear in such cases as those I have cited, they are more fit, more democratic, more imbued with the spirit of equal and free discussion than, say, the House of Lords—which Mr. Morrison is so anxious to retain. Only in those cases—fortunately they are few in number—where some twenty years ago

certain trade unions altered their rules so as to restrict the free democratic choice of the members, or where a needlessly complicated structure has a similar effect in practice, has there been any departure from democratic procedure. Wherever it has happened, it has wounded democracy in the house of its friends. But it is not to these that Mr. Phillips is making reference. He is referring precisely to the unions that are most democratic in their structure. It is democracy and the beneficial results of democracy that appear to Mr. Phillips' heated imagination as "intrigue and infiltration."

Mr. Phillips does not belong to the generation that had to do the hard slogging work for Socialism, whose self-sacrificing efforts were described by Liberals in those days as "Socialist intrigue and penetration." If he had ever had to do this hard work he might have been startled and ashamed to find that in the same week-end that he launched his circular, the Liberals and Tories were joining in the witch-hunt against working men whose opinions are Communist. "We must oppose," they said, "Communist infiltration in the trade union movement and elsewhere, with all our heart and strength." Who signed that manifesto, which was timed to come out simultaneously with that of Morgan Phillips? Who but Lady Violet Bonham-Carter, the peeress daughter of the old Liberal Prime Minister Asquith? Who but Clement Davies, leader of the Liberal capitalists in the House of Commons? Who but Lord Vansittart of all men? These be your allies, Morgan Phillips, in your "great campaign" to prevent the trade unionists of Britain from choosing a Communist to sit on their branch committees or executive councils. Isn't it a little too crude? Isn't it obvious that when you are cheered on by the capitalists and even offered their help against Communists, it is because they know you are playing the capitalists' game? The capitalist leaders represent those who are out for rent, interest and profits, who are out to throw the burden of the crisis on to the shoulders of the working class and to prevent Communists or anyone else shifting some of the burden on to those who are best able to bear it. That is why they join in with you, Mr. Phillips, and, provided you are against the Communists, they don't care how rotten and baseless are the arguments you produce.

It is not arguments, however, which matter in this document issued with the authority of the Labour Party Executive, but the intention behind the arguments. The intention to introduce splitting tactics is the sinister feature. Faced by the growing resentment of the trade union movement at the abandonment of the General Election programme and the ill-concealed endeavours to keep wages pegged while profits riot unchecked, Right-Wing Labour leaders, so far from paying heed to those who elected them, have set themselves to disorganise the movement.

But there is a still more disquieting feature in this move and more sinister forces lie behind it. Irving Brown and other emissaries of the American Federation of Labour working hand-in-hand with

the U.S.A. Department of State have their fingers in this pie. It is they who have urged and stimulated this move in Britain following on the moves they have made in other countries of Europe.

Therefore, the challenge to the unity and strength of the British trade unions has to be taken up with a full understanding of the dark and vicious transatlantic forces that are the original inspiration of this move. That is to say: the workers in the trade unions of this country will not resist this splitting move with full success unless they tackle also the policies that have been thrust upon them, or upon so many of their leaders. Let no one imagine that this splitting move arises from the spleen of a minor trade union official who suddenly finds himself occupying a post held for so many years by Arthur Henderson and then by James Middleton. The reasons lie deeper than that. The policy of Cripps has its own logic. Once the decision was taken to accept the proposals of the Federation of British Industries in regard to capital investment, etc., the rest of the outlook of the F.B.I. with its opposition to militant trade unionism had sooner or later to follow as a matter of course.

The foreign policy of Bevin after two years had its inevitable consequence in the internal policy of Cripps; and the policy of Cripps has its inevitable consequence in the policy of Morgan Phillips. Those who had cherished the hope that the Tory policy pursued in continuity by Ernest Bevin from 1945 onwards could be regarded in isolation and would have no effect on internal policy can now see how deeply they were mistaken. In 1945 the prospect of speedy advance to Socialism was opening out in Europe. Had the British Government and the British Labour Party joined with the progressive and democratic forces, both this country and all of Europe would be in a better position today; but by throwing this country into the arms of the American millionaires, the most profoundly anti-working class and anti-trade union forces in the world were given their chance, with the consequence that has been seen throughout Europe and is now becoming fully visible in this country. The Europe of 1945 was their chance and our chance for speedy socialism. What alarmed and frightened the capitalists of the United States should have been welcomed and supported here. The contrary course was taken and though it has not held back development in all of Europe, it has put this country at any rate in "Queer Street."

In his party political broadcast on the 3rd of January, the Prime Minister recklessly attacked the U.S.S.R. in order to placate the millionaires in the United States, which he described as a country "standing for individual liberty in the political sphere and for the maintenance of human rights." I have been in that paradise of Mr. Attlee's, not so long ago. I saw something of that boasted "individual liberty" in the shape of unrestricted liberty of the big capitalists to exploit the mass of the people. In the Southern States I saw Negroes deprived of "human rights" and I learned of that

practice of lynching which has made the U.S.A. a black spot in civilisation. I was, therefore, not altogether surprised when the capitalists of the United States the moment the war was over seized their opportunity to raise prices against us, to spread their bases all over the world and to constitute themselves "the heirs to the British Empire", in Greece, Turkey, Iran, China and the Far East. Nor was I surprised when, this last year, the American capitalists imposed their Taft-Hartley Act aimed at crippling the trade unions to an extent beyond what Churchill and Baldwin achieved years ago, nor that they would follow this up by attempts to impose on the victims of their Marshall "Plan" a corresponding policy by legislation, as in France, or otherwise, as in Britain. But I must confess I was surprised that a Labour Prime Minister who knows these facts as well as I do should pay this tribute of fulsome compliments. The tribute we have to pay in dollars should be enough for him or any man!

This attack upon the U.S.S.R. has now been followed by that of Lord Vansittart on 11th January: taken together they demonstrate the broad unity of reaction from Right-Wing Labourites to extreme Toryism.

It is well that the younger members of our trade unions should realise what has been our past experience in these matters. Before the first world war in 1914 and up to the end of that war we had a united Labour movement in this country. Inside the Labour Party itself all shades of opinion were given expression and all tendencies existed. The Right Wingers amongst the leaders had not dared to initiate the policy of splitting on which they entered soon after the end of that first world war. The result of that policy was fatal in its effects for over a generation; Ramsay MacDonald and others who had followed him were able to drive the Communists out of the Labour Party amid the cheers of the capitalists, whose influence inside the Labour movement enabled the Right-Wing to do it and to whom MacDonald and other leaders of the Right-Wing openly crossed over in 1931. To curry favour with the capitalists Ramsay MacDonald drove Tom Mann, the outstanding figure of British trade unionism, out of the Labour Party in 1924 and pursued him with a vindictive imprisonment in 1932. A shame? Yes. But it is also a shame that now for twenty years and more Communist members of trade unions have been regularly paying their political levy without being allowed the rights or benefits to which that payment should entitle them.

It was in 1928 that the Trade Union Congress declared itself for Mondism, for the ending of class struggle, for going hand-in-hand with the Federation of British Industries and other employers headed by Sir Alfred Mond, then chief of Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd. The next year, 1929, saw the ill-starred decision to request trade unions to break their democratic principles and rule out Communists from holding office. This statement, though the vast majority of the unions had refused to change their constitutions, was reaffirmed in 1934 and had added to it the Black Circular which threatened to

disaffiliate trades councils accepting as delegate anyone duly elected by his trade union branch—if he was a Communist. During that period from 1927 onwards, the workers of this country underwent many hardships, which they were unable to withstand effectively because their natural protection—from their trade unions—had been enfeebled by undemocratic measures and by these bans and ex-communications devised in the circles of Ramsay MacDonald, Philip Snowden, and other Quislings-to-be of the Labour Movement.

In the coalfields in particular during those years there was such misery, poverty, unemployment, malnutrition, occupational disease and increased accident rates as had not been known for generations. The difficulty during and after the war of obtaining sufficient manpower for the coalmines is the direct product of those years and the misery which burned itself into the minds of our mineworkers, so that mothers would say to their sons, “Whatever you do, don’t go down the mine”.

During those same years the Miners’ Federation of Great Britain, now transformed into the National Union of Mineworkers, was at the lowest ebb of its fortunes and could do little to protect the working miners and their wives and families. There were many reasons for this, but amongst them is one outstanding reason that it is relevant to recall today: mining trade unionism was split; in several coalfields there were Yellow Unions, so-called non-political unions fighting against the County Associations of Miners. In addition many Communists who had fought and were again to fight hard on behalf of their fellows were expelled from the unions, some of whose officials hoped that thereby they would curry favour with the coal-owners. I was one of those who, despite a long record of active service in the South Wales Miners’ Federation, was expelled. Did my expulsion make the South Wales coalowners soften their hearts? It did not, but I think I will not be accused of immodesty if I say that it weakened the resistance of the miners in the Welsh valleys. Why, as late as the beginning of this war Abe Moffatt, President of the Scottish Miners, was not allowed to belong to his union; he was a Communist. His services to the miners went for nothing; he had offended the powers that be. Yet so soon as this undemocratic procedure was removed, the Scottish miners, recognising his worth, elected Abe far above all other candidates for the Presidency of their union. What Ramsay MacDonald and other future Quislings did to Tom Mann and other militants years ago to the great detriment of the movement, the successors of Ramsay MacDonald, who seem to have taken on a double portion of his spirit, are once more trying to do in 1948.

It goes right against the fundamental principles of trade unionism. The principle of trade unionism, as it has grown up in this country for nearly two centuries, has been to organise *all* the workers, in each trade or craft, industry or service. This principle over-rode all distinctions of religion or politics. Whatever a man might think on

matters of religion, whatever views he might hold in politics, he was just as entitled as the next man to join his union—and, once joined, to enjoy *the same rights* and receive the same benefits as everybody else. This is democracy. Anything less than this is undemocratic, and as such opposed to the whole tradition and principles of British trade unionism.

Moreover, this type of attack on Communist members of the Labour movement not only poisons trade union principles but always precedes an attack on the working class. So soon as Ramsay MacDonald, Frank Hodges and the rest of that litter had in 1924 thrust the Communists out of the Labour Party, the way was open for Tory Baldwin in July, 1925, to proclaim that “the wages of all workers must come down” and to follow this up in the period of the General Strike and the miners’ struggle of 1926, with the *Emergency Powers Act* and the *Trade Disputes and Trade Unions Act* of 1927. Today also, this attack by successors of Ramsay MacDonald upon the Communists is a cover and a basis of attack upon the trade unions and upon the working class. Let anyone who doubts this remember the significant phrase of Mr. Phillips who “expects a campaign of sabotage . . . by the Communists and their fellow-travellers”. *And their fellow-travellers!* This serves notice on any militant trade unionist, any active fighter for his fellow-workers. Dare to query the wisdom of Bevin in squandering blood and treasure on the Royalist-fascists of Greece or in the Middle East, venture to have a doubt of Cripps’ cut in housing (on Christian principles), presume to cavil at Attlee’s kow-towing to the monopoly capitalists of the U.S.A., and you will at once become “a fellow-traveller,” a dangerous element, perhaps even “an agitator.” With the weight of Wall Street behind them, they want this time to make a clean sweep; and then to turn round to their Yankee “benefactors” and assure them that British trade unions are at last thoroughly tame.

The object of the Wall Street millionaires who dominate the United States Government, the object of the emissaries of the American Federation of Labour is one and the same—to break up the World Federation of Trade Unions or any of its sections. Therefore they drove hard against the C.G.T. (the French Trade Union Congress), and in the latter part of December the capitalist press all over the world uttered whoops of joy hailing the disruption of the French trade union movement. They rejoiced too soon. The workers of France have not been seduced from what, for them, is the relatively new experience of one main single trade union centre—only a handful followed the splitters. Nevertheless, even a partial split was a crime against this new-found unity. Had it been successful it would have delivered the working class over bound hand and foot to the tender mercies of American capitalism. In view of this history, how much worse would it be if in this country where for over a century there has been one single trade union movement, we should now have the introduction of political splits and divisions.

A strict comparison of the actions which could result from Morgan Phillips' letter and the splitting activities of Leon Jouhaux yields the following conclusion: In Britain the supporters of the Labour Party made up a majority of trade union membership; in France the majority of the trade union membership are supporters of the Communist Party; in each case there are prominent unionists and trade union leaders who hold a minority standpoint and who, nevertheless, have been democratically elected to their positions. In France, the Communist Party, though in a great majority within the trade unions, within the C.G.T., held fast to the principles of democracy and never for a moment suggested that splitting tactics should be introduced. In Britain the Secretary of the Labour Party, also conscious of the majority of General Secretaries and trade union leaders as supporters, proposes to introduce splitting tactics and political discrimination: and he and his circle, while proclaiming that they are "against disruption," applaud disruption in France. In France it was the minority who carried through the attempted split, the sole result of which could be to weaken the working class. In Britain the minority, Communists or militants, are utterly against any split because their chief desire is to strengthen the working class.

Fellow trade unionists, you are part of a mighty labour movement, whose power lies in its unity and its democratic methods. Today that unity is in danger. The principles and methods of trade unionism are at stake; and thereby our livelihood and our hopes of a better future. Stand firm against these attacks. Do not suffer these American-inspired attempts to play havoc with our trade unions, which our fathers built and which we should be proud to preserve. Stand firm.

WHO HINDERS PRODUCTION?

By J. R. CAMPBELL

IT would be salutary if politicians and journalists sometimes reflected on the meaning of the words they use. It would have saved the *Daily Herald*, in introducing the now notorious circular of Mr. Morgan Phillips, from declaring that "Communists helped by 'fellow travellers' are planning a campaign of sabotage against the Labour Government in the New Year." This was surpassed by the leader in the same number (December 22nd) headed "Sabotage," which said "The new Communist campaign of industrial sabotage is summed up by Morgan Phillips, Secretary of the Labour Party, in the statement he issues this morning."

Now it happens that industrial sabotage has a very clear meaning. My pocket Oxford dictionary defines it as "intentional damage done by workmen to their materials, etc., especially in disputes with employers." If Communists have embarked or are about to embark

on any such campaign this is a matter of very great interest not only to the trade unions and the employers, but to the police. For if Communists are telling the workers to damage the materials or the machines at which they work then they are guilty of a criminal offence and the noble Mr. Morgan Phillips ("the man who talked to Stalin") has earned his ration of ephemeral notoriety. Alas, for a man who has just uncovered a campaign of industrial sabotage, Mr. Morgan Phillips is surprisingly vague.

But did not Harry Pollitt, in his recent report, enunciate a change in Communist policy in relation to production? He certainly did and it will repay all trade unionists to discover in what that change consists.

It does not consist of the Communists saying that increased production is no longer important for Britain. For the Communists cannot fight for Britain's independence without fighting for its economic recovery and they cannot fight for its economic recovery without supporting under proper safeguards measures for increased production.

We do not know what the actual production of Britain is at the moment in relation to pre-war. The Government refrained from telling us in the *Economic Survey for 1947* and will no doubt continue to keep us in the dark in the Survey for 1948. Mr. Tibor Barna has, however, estimated that the total output for 1946 even allowing for deterioration of quality was equal to that of 1938, while the total output of 1947 was probably about 5 per cent. higher. If this is an accurate estimate then clearly we are not producing enough to maintain a greatly expanded export trade, a large capital development programme, and increased supplies of consumer goods. There is no doubt, therefore, that a larger production is necessary. The question is how is it to be obtained in present circumstances.

The essence of Harry Pollitt's thesis on production is that we cannot obtain sufficient production to guarantee national recovery and independence unless there is a complete change in the policy of the Government.

Without a decisive change in Government policy no solution to the crisis is possible, however hard the workers strive.

Any tendency to separate the issue of production from the main issue of the change of policy necessary can only result in trailing behind the Government's reactionary policy.

Now this question is being placed in still sharper terms because of the way Britain is being tied behind the Marshall Plan; production increases will not be utilised for the benefit of Britain or the people, but will be subordinated to the general aims of American policy.

Throughout the whole post-war production drive the Communist Party has always claimed that increased production was not a matter of fiercely speeding up the workers but on the contrary was primarily to be secured by the modernisation of industry with improved wages and conditions for the workers.

The workers in all industries cannot, of course, be provided, over-

night, with new machines and so the Communists asked the workers to help production along until the new machines came along. They asked them to reduce absenteeism and co-operate with the employers in making, on the basis of existing equipment, such small changes as would lead to increased production, until the modernisation programme could be put through.

It cannot be said that this production drive obtained any outstanding successes. In some of the industries where increased production was most essential there was no incentive bonus. From the Summer of 1946 onward another obstacle became apparent—namely, material shortages. How could workers in an engineering shop or a shipyard make an increased productive effort when they were constantly being held up because of shortages of steel?

These material shortages were largely due to the fact that the Government had taken no effective steps by means of a policy of differential wages and rationing to get workers to go to the undermanned materials industries, like textiles, coal, bricks and foundries.

Still it was possible to believe that the Government was stumbling along in the proper direction. In the *Economic Survey for 1947* (which was prepared about the end of the previous year) it was announced that no less than 20 per cent. of the gross national income in 1947 was to be devoted to capital development. In the same Survey the aim of completing 300,000 houses in 1947 was also underlined.

From the moment that the Truman Doctrine was announced the perspective began to change. For the meaning of that doctrine was that the United States had definitely abandoned the policy of Big Three co-operation and was embarking on a cold war with the Soviet Union into which the British Government was speedily drawn.

When the history of 1947 comes to be written nothing will be found to be more significant than the fact that after the stoppage of industry with its consequential losses, after it had become clear that the U.S. loan was going to run out much faster than expected, after new events were daily illustrating the full seriousness of our economic position, the Government—fully committed to the cold war against the Soviet Union—was still refusing to speed up the demobilisation of the armed forces. In March, 1947, after the crisis had come into the open, there were 1,401,000 men in the armed forces. Six months later, in September, there were 1,231,000. The net demobilisation during those months of ever deepening crisis was only 170,000 men.

Not only was the Government refusing to make more labour available in general but it was refusing to adopt a policy of differential wages and rationing to get workers to go into the essential undermanned industries. In the first months of 1947 most of the new workers who were becoming available were drifting into transport or into other consumer services. The Government in its 1947 Economic Survey had forecast that there should be 1,370,000 workers in Transport and Shipping in December, 1947. In point of fact there were

1,417,000 in it by June. It had forecast 4,325,000 workers in distribution and other consumer services, but in June there were already 4,430,000. Manpower because of lack of a proper wage policy was going where in the national interest it ought not to go.

Still more disquieting was the attitude of the Government in treating material shortages as something to which its whole programme had to conform instead of making a special effort to overcome these shortages. Steel was the supreme example. Instead of nationalising the industry, taking special steps to speed up construction of new coke ovens and blast furnaces, seeking to maximise the efficiency of existing plant by improvements in furnace practice, use of oxygen at the melting stage, etc., the Government announced that the nationalisation of the industry would be postponed. It was months later before it took steps to jog the steel industry into an examination of the possibility of rapidly increasing production above the target of 14 million tons of ingot steel per annum.

By this time the glaring discrepancy between the Government's foreign trade programme, its capital development programme, and the shortage of manpower, arising from its general policy became patent to the merest amateur. Either to release more manpower, make a powerful attack on the steel bottleneck, or alternatively to cut down the capital programme which in effect meant repudiating the General Election promises, were the two courses confronting the Government, and it promptly chose the latter.

So two years after the Government was elected the worker who had been called to do a little extra, until new machines were made available, or until more workers were demobilised, was at last told in a number of industries that no new machines were coming and that no great change in the rate of demobilisation could be expected. Virtually the whole of the textile machinery production was earmarked for export, and Sir Stafford Cripps extolled the virtues of "make do" with the old machines. While production of specialised plant and machinery for industry was to be increased from £110 million to £121 million per annum, the amount available for the home market was reduced from £65 million to £49 million.

All these things added up to an abandonment of general election policy. Whereas previously increased effort on the part of the workers was only a subordinate means of increasing production, inferior in its effects to an increase in the labour force or to comprehensive modernisation, it now began to occupy a disproportionate place in the production plans. The more the Government clung to its large armed forces, the greater the capital cuts which it initiated, the more it tried to take it out of the existing labour force by speeding up or by longer hours. Yet everyone understands that this will be unable to yield the production needed to rescue the country from the crisis. That is what Pollitt means when he argues that without a decisive change in Government policy—a change of foreign policy involving

sharp cuts in the armed forces and a resumption of a full scale capital development programme—"no solution to the crisis is possible however hard the workers strive".

Pollitt insists that it is not only necessary to remove the obstacles to production by changing Government policy, but that it is also essential to prevent the existing production from being wasted. Messrs. A. J. Cummings and Morgan Phillips may pretend that the statement "production increases will not be utilised for the benefit of Britain or the people but will be subordinated to the general aims of American policy" is an incitement to the workers to stop production. Not so: for the context shows that it is an incitement of the workers to fight for a change of policy.

Is Mr. Phillips so ignorant of affairs as not to know that in return for Marshall aid Britain will be expected to make unrequired exports (exports for which it will receive no ultimate return) to a number of European countries? Does he not know that there is a danger our right to use our coal exports to get timber or steel may be challenged and that we may be forced to throw these into a general European pool? Does he not grasp that the maintenance of armed forces, vastly greater in relation to our working population than those of the U.S.A., is a waste of the production of the workers?

A call to end those things is not a call to sabotage production, but to release it from the stranglehold of the monopolists and from the wastes and frustrations imposed upon it by Government policy. The details of that policy are contained in the Communist Party's Three Years' Plan, which is based on faith in the British people's ability to rescue itself by its own efforts.

FOREIGN IMPERIALISM IN INDONESIA

By NEIL STEWART

THE negotiations for the Cease Fire Agreement (signed 17th January) in Indonesia have revealed the increasing pressure exercised by the U.S.A. State Department (whose plan was based on the Dutch programme) and thereby once more have focused attention on the struggle of Imperialism against the Indonesian Republic.

The Republic of Indonesia is an expression of the new forces in the East which today are challenging the domination of the old and new imperialisms. The problem is essentially an international one; it is not merely a struggle between Indonesian nationalism and the Dutch, but between rising New Democracy and the interests of British, American and Dutch imperialism.

It was not until the beginning of the 20th century that the enormous possibilities of the East Indies became apparent. It became apparent also that, in the rough and tumble of world politics, Holland was incapable of protecting and exploiting her possessions. The strategic position of the Indies on the line of communications of the British Empire meant that Britain could not permit a hostile power to become entrenched there. By mutual consent the Indies entered into the British Far Eastern defence plan and at the same time became a valuable area of exploitation for British capital.

Anglo-Dutch business collaboration, based mainly on colonial exploitation, spread throughout the world and formed a jigsaw of interlocking interests binding together British and Dutch imperial interests in five continents.

The closest link is provided by the twin firms of Lever Bros. and Unilever N.V. The issued capital of the British firm is £69 millions, and of the Dutch firm 309 million guilders. They control 400 firms operating in different parts of the world, and 280 of their associations have an issued capital of over £300 millions. It would be no exaggeration to say that Lever Bros. controls almost the entire oils and fats production of the British Empire.

The basis of this combine was the cheap production of raw materials; only by the existence of colonial countries with a depressed standard of living can the profits of Lever Bros. and Unilevers N.V. be maintained. Any attempt by the colonial countries to assert their independence would be a blow at the vital interests of this great combine.

The political tendency of this organisation can be well imagined. It was indicated in pre-war days by the fact that Lever Bros. was a corporate member of the Anglo-German Fellowship, and that five of the directors were individual members of the select organisation for sympathy with Nazi Germany.*

American, as well as British and Dutch interests, cashed in on the petroleum deposits of the Indies. Although these deposits were not comparable with those of the Middle East, they were nevertheless of considerable importance in the Eastern world. British-Dutch interests merged in the *Bataafische Petroleum Maatschappij*, of whose shares 40 per cent. by the Royal-Dutch Co. Shell, closely connected with Anglo-Iranian and Burma Oil, controls the petroleum production of the British Empire, as Levers controls the oils and fats. A large section of its shares are held by the Government, who also appoint a number of directors, including representatives of the Services.

Once the value of the Indies oil deposits became apparent, the Americans clamoured for concessions. The Royal Dutch-Shell group and the American Standard-Vacume came to an agreement to divide up the oil-bearing areas between them. In 1939 the Anglo-Dutch areas produced 75 per cent. of the petroleum, while most of the

*See *Tory M.P. Simon Haxey*, London, 1939.

remainder went to the Americans. Experts have estimated petroleum investments in the Indies at £100 millions, of which the Dutch share is £45 millions, the British £30 millions, and the United States slightly less than £20 millions.

The best comment on the political direction of Royal-Dutch was the report in the *Daily Telegraph* of the funeral of its head, Sir Henri Deterding (10/2/39):

At the funeral of Sir Henri Deterding, Bishop Schultz of Scwerin said: "Sir Henri had the boldness of a Napoleon and the mental powers of a Cromwell. He had fought all his life against Bolshevism . . ."

Mr. Agnew, a managing director of Shell Transport and Trading, also paid tribute. Wreaths were sent by Herr Hitler and the Netherlands Government. As Herr Hilgenfeldt laid the Fuehrer's wreath he said: "In the name and on the instructions of the German Fuehrer, I greet thee, Heinrich Deterding, the great friend of Germany. . . ."

In pre-war days Britain, though her influence in South East Asia, dominated both rubber and tin production. While British interests were able to control production, the United States was the greatest consumer of these two raw materials. Post-war American synthetic rubber production has broken the British monopoly and kept down the price of rubber, facing many plantations in Malaya with ruin.

The Indies was second only to Malaya in the production of rubber. The issued capital of British plantation companies in Indonesia totalled £20 millions (*Stock Exchange Year Book*, 1946), and Mr. Noel Baker stated in the House of Commons (22.11.45) that the value of the British plantations in the Indies equalled £30 millions. The great British managing agencies and merchants, who are the dominant influence in the plantation industry in the East, have considerable interests in Indonesia. Harrisons & Crossfields are managers of plantations in the Indies with an issued capital of £5 millions. Francis Peak & Co. are managers of plantations with a capital of £3,500,000, and Eastern Industries Ltd. run estates with a capital of nearly £2 millions.

The policy of the trusts in general, and some of the plantation owners in particular, was aptly expressed by Sir Eric MacFadyen, chairman of the Djasinga Rubber and Produce Co., at its general meeting in December, 1945. He said that the Indonesian leaders were "characterised by complete political irresponsibility," and that

"the best thing we can hope for is that the resulting problems, which should never have been allowed to arise, may be resolved by the re-establishment of Dutch authority at an early date."

Sir Eric is also a director of Harrison & Crossfield, whose issued capital is £2,500,000 and who are managing agents for plantation companies in South East Asia with a capital of over £11,000,000. He is also director of 22 other companies.

The Dutch mining interests are closely connected with the great British mining companies which controlled Malayan and Burmese tin production. Here the Dutch Government and private interests merged. The Banka mines are Government-owned, and the Govern-

ment also owns 62 per cent. of the capital of the N. V. Billiton, which mines the tin deposits of Billiton and Singkep, and the bauxite deposits of the Rhio archipelago. The ore from these mines was previously smelted in British works in Singapore, although later a smelting works was built at Arnhem, in Holland. The British firm of Consolidated Tin Smelters (capital £5 millions), one of the most important mining concerns in Britain, had, according to the *Mining Year Book* of 1947, a "substantial interest" in the Arnhem works. The same source discloses that Billiton owns 9.5 per cent. of Consolidated Tin Smelters shares.

Until the war, the mining and smelting of South East Asian tin ore lay predominantly in Anglo-Dutch hands. The Americans tried hard to break the monopoly, and at one time imported tin ore from Malaya to smelt it in California. An export tax was immediately clamped down by the Malayan government, which put an end to American ambitions in this direction.

American interests, however, demanded that in view of the United States participation in the war, the Anglo-Dutch monopoly should be broken. After the fall of Holland in 1940 the American Government financed the construction of a smelting works in Texas with a capacity of 30,000 tons annually. The Billiton Co. managed the works, and the intention was to ship the ore from Sumatra when the war was won. *The New York Times* commented:

Far Eastern tin will be smelted after the war in a Texas City, Tex., plant, operated by the Tin Processing Company, an affiliate of the Billiton Co., which successfully conducted the Arnhem smelter in Holland prior to the outbreak of war, manufacturers connected with the industry declared last week." (30.4.45).

It was expected the first shipments would arrive one year after the end of the war. The same paper threatened a "trade war" against Britain by the U.S.A. if the Malayan tin export duty was not removed.

The result of the American moves in the realm of rubber and tin was to reduce the British capacity for trading in dollars. As long as synthetic rubber could compete with natural, and tin could be smelted in the States, the pre-war monopolies which brought so many dollars to the British treasury could never be re-established.

What is the amount of foreign investments in Indonesia? The most accurate estimate puts the figure for 1900 as 750 million guilders, rising to 1,600 in 1915 and to 4,000 millions in 1929. Estimates for 1941 put investment values at between 4 and 6 billion guilders. The British share was considerable. Plantation interests totalled between £20 and £30 millions, petroleum about £30 millions, plus considerable interests in other fields. It is not difficult to see that British interests must have equalled the figure of £100 millions invested in Malaya.

Before the war U.S. investments in the Indies were catching up with the British. They forged ahead in the plantation business in the years previous to the war, and Americans obtained vast oil prospecting concessions in New Guinea. By 1939, American capital investments could not have totalled much less than £50 millions.

Dutch investments, including Government loans, banking, shipping and trade, were estimated at £250 millions. Lesser interests, totalling about £100 millions, included Franco-Belgian, German, Japanese and local Chinese capital.

How, then, will these economic factors determine the present course of events in Indonesia?

There are today three forces at work in the fertile islands of Indonesia.

The first is British imperialism, which seeks to re-establish by means of the Dutch, its dominant position in the Indies. It is significant that Mr. Bevin's first important action in foreign affairs was to sign an agreement with the Dutch to provide for the return of their power to the Indies. It is also significant that British forces held bridgeheads in Java until the Dutch army, trained and armed by Britain, was available in strength to replace them. Holland, too, was assured of British support whenever the affairs of the Indonesian Republic were discussed at U.N.O.

The second factor in the future of Indonesia is "boom and bust" American capitalism, which envisages all Asia as a market for its goods. The newspaper owner, Henry Luce, wrote:

We do not think of Asia as worth only a few millions a year to us. In decades to come, Asia will be worth to us, four, five, ten millions of dollars a year. (*Life*, 17.2.41).

Already, in the first quarter of 1947, American exports to the East were 510 per cent. above the 1939 figure. Even the Dutch occupied areas of Indonesia received three times more goods in early 1947 than did the whole of the Netherlands East Indies in 1939.

Wall Street can see the positive advantages of an advance into Indonesia. It would provide a market for American goods, a source of raw materials, and an investment for surplus capital. It could equally provide the raw materials and the market for the American-dominated Japanese industrial machine. It would further eliminate rival British interests and place the U.S.A. on the threshold of the Indian Ocean, and in one of the most important strategic positions in the world.

The third and vital factor in our picture is the emergence of the Indonesian Republic, representative of New Democracy in Asia, challenging the rights both of the old imperialism and the new; creating, with Viet-Nam and Liberated China, the new pattern for social change in the East.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into any correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

THE REVOLUTION BEGINS, IN PARIS

While the manuscript of the "Manifesto" was going through the press in London (it took nearly the whole of February, 1848, to set it up at 46 Liverpool Street, Bishopsgate), Marx in Brussels, apart from work on his WAGE—LABOUR AND CAPITAL, was taking a very active part in the Democratic Association. At its meeting of Sunday, 13th February, the answer to the Fraternal Democrats was discussed.

In mid-February Engels, expelled from Paris, arrived in Brussels, where on 20th February he reported to a meeting of the Democratic Association (Marx in the Chair) on the political reasons for his expulsion. Two days later both Marx and Engels were speakers at a celebration of the 1846 rising in Cracow.

On Thursday, 24th February, while the copies of the "Manifesto" were coming off the press in London, the "bourgeois monarchy" in France was overthrown by revolution: King Louis-Philippe, under the name of William Henry Smith, made a rapid get-away to England. There were immediate repercussions in Belgium—Marx immediately took an active part in preparations for a republican armed rising in Brussels. The Democratic Association, now in daily session, demanded of the City Council that the Civil Guard should take in armed workers and artisans; and passed an address of greeting to the provisional government of the French Republic. The Belgian Government, alarmed, took counter-measures; they arrested on 27th February amongst others Wilhelm Wolff and treated him with great brutality. More was to follow.

On Friday, 3rd March, Marx, who had just got a letter from Flocon on behalf of the French provisional government cancelling his expulsion from France and inviting him to return thither, late that afternoon received a royal ordinance for his expulsion within 24 hours from Belgium. That same night (4th March, 1 a.m.), Marx, busy making ready for his journey, was arrested by the Belgian police.

THE ASSOCIATION DEMOCRATIQUE OF BRUSSELS TO THE FRATERNAL DEMOCRATS ASSEMBLING IN LONDON.

We received your letter of December last, the proposals contained in which concerning the Democratic Congress of all nations and establishment of a monthly correspondence between your society and ours were immediately taken into consideration.

The propositions of holding the first Democratic Congress here in Brussels, with a view of calling the second in London; the first Congress to be called by our society for the anniversary of the Belgian revolution in September next, and the programme of business to be prepared by the committee of this society; these propositions were agreed to unanimously and enthusiastically . . .

The state of our society is as prosperous as can possibly be desired. The number of our members is increasing weekly, and the interest taken by the public in general, and by the working classes in particular, in our proceedings is equally on the increase.

The best proof, however, of our progress is the interest excited in the provinces of the country by our movements. From the most important towns of Belgium we have received summons to send delegates for the purpose of establishing democratic societies similar to ours, and keeping up constant relations with the metropolitan association.

We have given to these appeals our immediate attention. We sent a deputation to Ghent to call a public meeting with a view of establishing a branch society. The meeting was exceedingly numerous, and received our deputation, consisting of members belonging to several nations, with an enthusiasm hardly to be described. The foundation of a democratic society was immediately decided upon, and the names of members taken down. Since then we have received from Ghent the news that the society is definitively constituted, and has held a second meeting exceeding the first in numbers and enthusiasm. More than three thousand citizens were present, and, we are happy to say, they mostly consisted of working men.

We consider the ground gained at Ghent as a most important progress of our cause in this country. Ghent is the chief manufacturing town of Belgium, numbering above a hundred thousand inhabitants, and being in a great measure the centre of attraction for the whole labouring population of Flanders. The position taken by Ghent is decisive for all working class movements of the country. Thus we may accept the adhesion of the factory workers of that Belgian Manchester to the revival of a pure democratic movement, as implying and foreboding the adhesion of the generality of the Belgian proletarians . . .

We entirely share in the view which in your recent address to the working people of Great Britain and Ireland you have taken of the questions of "National Defences." We hope that this address will contribute in a great measure to the enlightenment of the people of England as to the question who are their veritable enemies.

We have equally seen with great pleasure the steps taken by the mass of the English Chartists to arrive, at last, at a close alliance between the Irish people and that of Great Britain. We have seen that there is a better chance now than ever before to break down that prejudice which prompted the Irish people to confound in one common hatred the oppressed classes of England with the oppressors of both countries. We hope to see very shortly united in the hands of Feargus O'Connor the direction both of the English and the Irish popular movement; and we consider this approaching alliance of the oppressed classes of both countries, under the banner of democracy, as a most important progress of our cause in general.

The Committee of the Association Democratique,

L. JOTTRAND, Chairman.

K. MARX, Vice-President.

Brussels, 13th February, 1848.

A. PICARD, Avt., Secretary.

—from the *Northern Star*, 4/3/1848.

THE SPEECH OF MARX, 22ND FEBRUARY, 1848.

Gentlemen,

In history there are striking analogies. The Jacobin of 1793 has become the Communist of today. In 1793 when Russia, Austria and Prussia partitioned Poland, the three powers banned the constitution of 1791, which by common agreement was condemned because of its supposed Jacobin principles.

And what had the Polish constitution of 1791 proclaimed? Nothing else than constitutional monarchy: law-making to be in the hands of the representatives of the country, freedom of the press, freedom of conscience, open conduct of the law courts, abolition of serfdom, etc. At that time all this was called the purest Jacobinism. Thus, gentlemen, you see history has gone forward. The Jacobinism of that time has today in the shape of Liberalism become everything that is most moderate.

The three powers have kept step with history. In 1846 when by incorporating Cracow in Austria they confiscated the last remains of Polish nationhood, they substituted the name of Communism for what they had once called Jacobinism.

Now what is the communism of the Cracow revolution? Was it communist to have wished to re-establish Polish nationhood? As well say that the war that Europe in coalition made upon Napoleon to save the nations was a communist war, and that the Congress of Vienna was composed of communist sovereigns. Or perhaps the Cracow revolution was communist for having wanted to set up a democratic government? No one will tax the millionaire citizens of Berne and of New York with having communist yearnings.

Communism denies the necessity for the existence of classes; it wants to abolish all classes and all class distinctions. The Cracow revolutionaries wanted only to wipe out the political distinctions within the classes: they wanted to give equal rights to the different classes.

But in what respect then was this Cracow revolution Communist?

Could it be by chance because it wanted to break the chains of feudalism, to give rights to tributary property and transform it into free property, into modern property?

If one said to the French property-owners "Do you know what the Polish democrats want? The Polish democrats want to introduce in their country the form of property which you have in your country". Then the French property-owners would reply "They do well". But, with M. Guizot, say to the French property-owners: "The Poles want to abolish property as it was set up by you in the revolution of 1789 and as it still exists amongst you". "What!" they would cry, "These men then are revolutionaries, Communists. Crush the infamous wretches"

Marx concluded his speech by saying:—

"If the Polish seigneur has no longer a Russian seigneur above him, the Polish peasant will none the less have a seigneur above him,

but a free seigneur instead of an enslaved seigneur. This political change will make no change in his social status.

"The Cracow revolution has given a glorious example to all Europe, in identifying the cause of nationality with the cause of democracy and with the giving of rights to the oppressed class It finds the confirmation of these principles in Ireland where the narrowing nationalist party has gone down into the grave with O'Connell and where the new nationalist party is above all for reforms and for democracy."

ADDRESS OF THE DEMOCRATIC ASSOCIATION

To the citizens, Members of the provincial government
of the French Republic.

Brussels, 28th February, 1848.

Citizens,

The Democratic Association having as its aim the union and brotherhood of all peoples . . . hereby offers you the homage of its congratulations, for the great task the French nation has just accomplished, and of its gratitude, for the immense service which this nation has just rendered to the cause of humanity

We believe we can conjecture with certitude that the nations nearest to France will be the first to follow her in the career on which she has just entered.

This conjecture is all the more certain in that France has just made a revolution destined rather to draw more close the bonds which link it to all nations than to menace the independence of any of them. We salute in the France of 1848 not the mistress of the peoples but their exemplar—France henceforward will look for no other homage.

We see already the great nation whose destinies you direct today, your sole authority the trust of all, we see it already, citizens, knitting again, even with peoples whom she has for long regarded as rivals for power, an alliance which the hateful policy of certain men succeeded in shattering.

England and Germany stretch out their hands once more to your great country. Spain, Italy, Switzerland and Belgium are going either to rise or to remain quiet and free under your threefold aegis.

Poland, like Lazarus, will rise again to the appeal you will make in a threefold language.

It is impossible that Russia itself will not mingle in accents of which the ear of Western and Southern peoples have as yet an imperfect knowledge.

Yours, Frenchmen, yours is the honour, yours is the glory to have laid the main foundations of this alliance of Peoples so prophetically sung by your immortal Béranger.

We offer you, Citizens, in all the flow of feelings of an immutable fraternity, the tribute of our deepest acknowledgment.

L. JOTTRAND, avt., President.

K. MARX, Vice-President.

MARX'S EXPULSION FROM BRUSSELS

To the Editor of the *Northern Star*,

Dear Sir,

After the important events accomplished in France, the position taken by the Belgian people and government, is of a greater interest than in ordinary times. I hasten, therefore, to inform your readers of what has happened since Friday, 25th of February.

The excitement and inquietude was universal in this town on the evening of that day. All sorts of rumours were spread, but nothing was really believed. The railway station was full of a crowd of people of all classes, anxious for the arrival of news. The French Ambassador, ex-Marquis de Rumigny, himself was there. At half-past twelve at night, the train arrived, with the glorious news of Thursday's revolution and the whole mass of people shouted, in one sudden outburst of enthusiasm: *Vive la Republique!* The news spread rapidly all over the town. On Saturday all was quiet. On Sunday, however, the streets were crowded with people, and every one was curious to see what steps would be taken by two societies—the Association Democratique and the Alliance. Both bodies assembled in the evening. The Alliance, a set of middle-class Radicals, resolved to wait, and thus retired from the movement. The Association Democratique, however, took a series of most important resolutions, by which this body placed itself at the head of the movement. They resolved to meet daily, instead of weekly; to send a petition to the town council, reclaiming the arming, not only of the middle-class Civic Guard, but of all citizens in districts. In the evening some rioting took place in the streets. The people cried: *Vive la Republique*, and assembled in masses around the Town Hall. Several arrests took place, but nothing of any consequence occurred.

Among the individuals arrested, there were two Germans—a political refugee, M. Wolff, and a working man. Now, you must know that there existed here, in Brussels, a German working men's society, in which political and social questions were discussed, and a German democratic newspaper. The Germans, resident in Brussels, were known for being generally very active and uncompromising Democrats. They were almost all members of the Democratic Association, and the vice-President of the German society, Dr. Marx, was also vice-president of the Democratic Association.

The government, perfectly aware of the narrow sentiment of nationalism prevalent among a certain class of the population of a small country like Belgium, immediately profited by these circumstances, in order to spread the rumour that the whole agitation for the Republic had been got up by the Germans . . .

On Saturday evening, Dr. Marx, amongst others, received a royal ordinance, ordering him to quit the country within twenty-four hours. He was engaged in arranging his trunks for the journey, when, at one o'clock in the morning, and in spite of the law which forbids the violation of the dwelling of a citizen from sunset to sunrise, ten police

agents, armed, headed by a commissary of police, broke into his house, seized upon him and led him to the Town Hall prison. No reason was given but that his passport was not in order, though he presented them at least three passports, and though he had resided in Brussels for three years! He was led off. His wife, seized with terror, instantly ran to see a Belgian lawyer, who always offered his services to persecuted foreigners—the same whose friendly interposition has been mentioned above—M. Jottrand, president of the Democratic Association. On her return, she met with a friend, M. Gigot. He accompanied her home. At the door of Dr. Marx's house, they found two of the policemen who had arrested her husband. Where have you taken my husband? asked she. Why, if you will follow us we will show you where he is. They led her, along with M. Gigot, to the Town Hall, but instead of fulfilling their promise, they delivered up both of them to the police, and *they were put into prison*. Mrs. Marx, who had left her three little children at home, with a servant only, was led into a room where she found a set of prostitutes of the lowest order, with whom she had to pass the night. Next morning she was led into a room where she had to stay three hours without fire, shivering with cold. M. Gigot was also retained. M. Marx had been put into a room with a *raving madman*, whom he was obliged to fight every moment. The most brutal treatment on the part of the jailors was joined to this infamous conduct.

At three o'clock in the afternoon, at last, they were conducted before the judge, who very soon ordered their liberation. And of what had Mrs. Marx and M. Gigot been indicted? Of *vagabondage*, because neither of them had a passport in their pockets.

M. Marx was equally liberated, and ordered to leave the country the same evening. Thus, after having been wantonly imprisoned during eighteen of the twenty-four hours left him to settle his affairs; after having had not only himself, but also his wife, separated for all that time from his three children, the eldest of whom has not attained her fourth year, he was sent away without a minute to put his affairs in order

Salutation and Fraternity,

YOUR OLD FRIEND.

Brussels, March 5th.

From a letter of Engels
to the *Northern Star*, 25/3/1848.

NEEDED URGENTLY. The following back numbers of the LABOUR MONTHLY: 1921, July and September; 1929, May; and 1930, October. Write to the Manager, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, regarding terms.

Book Reviews

The United States in a Nutshell

Star-Spangled Shadow by D. N. Pritt, K.C., M.P. (Frederick Muller, Ltd., 3s 6d).

In the compass of thirteen short chapters Mr. D. N. Pritt has packed an immense amount of up-to-the-minute, relevant, exciting and disquieting information about the U.S. He has done so, moreover, with a limpid clarity that makes the book read itself.

Here you have the whole picture of the rapid growth and expansionist drive of American big business now entering its monopolist and imperialist phase, and of the struggle of the American people and particularly the workers. There are plenty of facts and deadly quotations.

What I particularly like about the book is that it shows at every turn how real are the forces of progress and decency struggling in the U.S.A., who are our friends and allies and, at the same time, leaves one under no illusion as to the nature of the forces now in the ascendancy, and how Congress, the State Department and Wall Street are exploiting and abusing the generous impulse of the American people to turn the Marshall Plan not into a helping hand to the peoples of Europe but into an engine for intervening in the internal affairs of European countries to prop up the forces of the Right and conduct an economic, financial and diplomatic war of intervention against European Socialism.

I hope there will be editions of this book in both the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., not to mention the Continent, for it is exactly what is wanted today to help people arrive at clear and informed judgments of what is happening and what we ought to do about it. I have bought half-a-dozen copies for use as ammunition, and hope Mr. Pritt's book will be read by a lot of people and that they will do the same.

K. ZILLIACUS, M.P.

An Historian on the Russian Revolution

Lenin and the Russian Revolution by Christopher Hill (English Universities Press, 5s, 248 pp.).

In this book the author has performed a useful service, not only for the movement, but for the much wider public which the "Teach Yourself History" series is intended to serve. When a Marxist historian of growing reputation like Comrade Hill, who has already proved his worth with his original work on the English Revolution, devotes his talent to this all-important subject, the result is bound to be interesting.

In his introductory chapter he compares Russian, French and British history, to present a background (although one may not agree with all his points) for an understanding of the development of Lenin—his ideas, and his outstanding contribution to the development of Marxism. He shows how Lenin combined Marxism with all that was best in Russia's long revolutionary history and tradition. This is handled very well in his treatment of the growth of the Bolshevik Party and the unique role played by the foundation and development of the Soviets. The two chapters, "Towards a Workers' and Peasants' State" and "All Power to the Soviets," I found particularly good from this point of view. The wider international implications of Lenin's theoretical work, especially on Imperialism, the State, the building of socialism and revolutionary tactics, are, at the same time, adequately presented. Popularly and simply written, this will be a useful introductory study at a cheap price, something which has been lacking for a long time.

It is a pity that the idea of the books in this series, which seeks to present decisive events in history through the role played by the outstanding figure in the event, prevented adequate treatment of what is vital and necessary for our understanding of the reasons for the subsequent decisive victories of the revolution after Lenin's death.

Because of this completely insufficient attention was paid to the history of the Communist Party and the struggle around policy in the period immediately prior to and during Lenin's illness and death. Hence the role of Stalin as Lenin's successor, and his struggle against Trotskyism are not brought out. In his references to Trotsky, Comrade Hill correctly presents Lenin's criticism of Trotsky's role at decisive periods of the revolution. But Lenin did not and could not know that Trotsky and his confederates, already in those days, were wreckers and plotters criminally associated with foreign powers. Stalin succeeded to Lenin's leadership, not only because of his mastery of Lenin's teachings, but because of his record in the pre-revolutionary days, his editorship of *Pravda*, his work on the national question, his leadership in the insurrection, the decisive role entrusted to him by Lenin in the Civil War, and above all, his leadership of the Party in the critical tense period of Lenin's illness and death. If this had been done Trotsky's "History" could never have been included in the bibliography.

JOHN GOLLAN.

Malaya, True and False

The New Malaya by E. E. Dodd (Fabian Publications Ltd., in conjunction with Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1s).

There are a few outstanding facts about the new Malaya, the Malaya since the fall of Singapore.

Such facts are—the glorious part played by the Malayan guerilla fighters in 3½ years of self-sacrificing struggle against the Japanese; the new and quite remarkable political awakening of the Malays, whose 100,000 strong organisation, the Malay Nationalist Party, is for the first time bringing the Malays actively into the common anti-imperialist struggle; the vicious reign of persecution and police terror that has been aimed against the Labour movement and, in particular, against the communist leadership which leads that move-

ment as it led the guerilla resistance; and, finally, the extremely vocal movement of protest, co-ordinated on a national scale through the Malayan Council of Joint Action against the completely undemocratic proposals made for Malaya's future constitution and government.

These facts the Fabian pamphlet successfully ignores. On the contrary, the author describes the guerillas as a lawless mob. He is at great pains to exaggerate the backwardness of the Malays and their traditional hostility to the Chinese and Indians, a hostility that has always been of service to imperialism but that is certainly not a typical characteristic of the new Malaya. In the whole pamphlet there is no word of the repression now being exercised, under a Labour Colonial Secretary, against the Trade Unions. Mention is made of various progressive items of Labour legislation which are on the statute book, but which everybody knows have never been operated, but no mention is made of the Banishment Code and the Sedition Enactment under which T.U. leaders are banished without trial, or long terms of imprisonment imposed for quite mild criticism of the governing authorities.

Thus the picture which is given, whilst presenting many useful facts both of history and concerning the present constitutional proposals, is one-sided and inaccurate. Under a veneer of impartial objectivity there is, in fact, an obsequious acceptance of all the official Colonial Office "explanations" and a willingness to carry out their official propaganda. This servility reaches its height of absurdity when, in Mr. Rees-Williams' foreword to the pamphlet, it is seriously argued that it is the Colonial Government which is trying to push the people forward towards self-government and "has to use the arts of persuasion" to this end, whilst the poor ignorant people of Malaya, divided amongst themselves and loyal to their beloved Sultans, resent any kind of reforms and passionately cling to the status quo.

M. J. C.

LABOUR MONTHLY 1947 Bound Volumes

WILL BE AVAILABLE
VERY SHORTLY.

A permanent record which
you will want to refer to
over and over again.

Last-minute orders can still
be taken.

Send £1. or your 12 copies
for 1947 with 8/6, to

**134, Ballard's Lane,
London, N.3**

FOR A LASTING PEACE, FOR A PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY

Fortnightly organ of
THE COMMUNIST
INFORMATION BUREAU
Posted direct from Belgrade.

SUBSCRIPTION: 6 months, 4/-
12 months, 8/-
and
other Yugoslav publications
from

PROGRESSIVE BOOKSHOPS
or direct from
CENTRAL BOOKS, LTD.,
SUBS. DEPT.,
2 PARTON ST., LONDON,
W.C.1.

SUBSCRIBE NOW AND SAVE! SCIENCE & SOCIETY

Presents

A Centenary of Marxism

VOLUME XII, NUMBER 1, WINTER 1948

Double-sized — doubly valuable — included in annual subscription.

MARX AND ENGELS ON AMERICA *Herbert M. Morais*
THE ETHICS OF THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO *Howard Selsam*
THE PARADOX OF PROFIT *Thomas Kirkenfeld*
ENGELS ON THE FAMILY *Bernhard J. Stern*
ORIGINS OF PRESENT-DAY SOCIALISM .. *Paul M. Sweezy*
SAINT SIMON'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY .. *Samuel Bernstein*
GERMAN UTOPIANISM: "TRUE" SOCIALISM .. *Auguste Cornu*
MARX AND THE UTOPIAN WILHELM WEITLING

Hans Mühlestein

THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR INTERPRETED

BY MARX AND ENGELS *Christopher Hill*
MARX'S DOCTORAL DISSERTATION *Henry F. Mins*
THE NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG, 1948-49. *Margaret Schlauch*
MARX AND MATHEMATICS *Dirk J. Struik*

Published quarterly \$2.25 a year.

SCIENCE and SOCIETY, 30 East 20th Street,
New York 3, N.Y.

English Representatives:

COLLET'S LTD., 40 Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1.

DOLLARS . . .

—Without Strings!

Now, that is something we would all receive with cheers.

Twenty-five of that very rare kind of dollar came in the New Year from one of the many friends of this magazine of international Labour across the Atlantic. And not as a loan neither. Thanks, American friend, for the right kind of dollar.

But American dollars alone would count for little without the regular, hard-come-by British pounds, shillings and pence, which from November 1st to December 31st amounted to

£78 10s. 4d.

From:

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Bertha Howe		1	10	R.F.B., Doncaster	3	0	0
C. H. B. Locke	1	0	0	L. Rowan		6	0
E. D. McCallum		5	0	Gertrude Philibert	1	0	0
D. M. Clarke		10	0	L. Macgregor		1	10
W. F. Lakin Smith		2	6	Cambridge C.P.	3	5	0
R.F.B.	3	0	0	L'Humanité		2	0
S. Esterson	2	11	0	W. H. Humphreys		3	6
T.W.R., Oxford	2	0	0	D. M. Clarke		10	0
L. G. Rowan		6	0	T. Flood, Dundee		2	6
P. G. Husbands		8	0	Dr. I. McGregor		8	0
Mrs. A. Singer		10	0	W. D. Lakin Smith		8	6
W. H. Wild		5	6	P. A. Warner		8	0
A. Jenkin		10	0	R. S. Anderson		8	0
L'Humanité		2	0	Mr. H. Levitt	1	10	0
R. A. Pollock		8	0	A. E. Giebler		8	0
W. G. Harries		12	0	Royston Greene		3	6
J. Austin Smith		6	0	A. Peters		11	6
Mr. and Mrs. Humphreys		3	6	M. F. A. Philibert		1	6
Surrey Reader		18	0	Miss M. R. Mann		11	6
H. W. Westney		18	0	R. D. Manning		11	6
D. F. Oakshott		3	0	L. Mather		1	0
J. J. Christie		3	0	Helen Woolf		7	0
T. Blood		2	6	F. Renouf		5	0
E.M.	2	0	0	Olivia Greene	2	0	0
W. Rickard		3	0	F. W. Wedlake		2	6
Olivia Greene	2	0	0	D. H. Strathern		5	0
Royston Greene		3	6	E. J. Widdowson		7	6
D. H. Strathern		5	0	G. M. Bussy		8	0
F. Wedlake		2	6	Peggy Hall	1	0	0
F. Renouf		5	0	E. L. Norman		2	6
Walter Scobell		8	0	S. Morrissey		10	0
S. Morrissey		10	0	J. Goldman		5	0
Major F. H. Bird		18	0	F. Gubb		2	6
Leslie H. Mills		5	0	A. Ramage		2	6
D. Rees		10	0	J.B., Chelmsford		5	0
Dr. L. MacDonald		8	0	D. Rees		10	0
J. Melrick		8	0	R. McCloud		5	0
Mr. M. Mitchell	1	1	0	H. Lelson	25	0	0
Mr. H. Eldridge		8	0	Socialist Sailor	1	0	0
J. MacQueen		8	0	P. Brinson		10	0
E. D. McCallum		5	0	J. A. Purton		5	0
J. Reynolds		10	0	Director	2	0	0
H. Horinsky		2	6	Australian Business Man		2	6
J.B., Chelmsford		5	0				
H.S.M., Kilmarnock		5	0				
T. Dewhurst		9	0				
					£78	10	4